

Douglas C. Smith, Esq. (SBN 160013)
 Daniel W. Ferris, Esq. (SBN 318813)
 SMITH LAW OFFICES, LLP
 4001 Eleventh Street
 Riverside, CA 92501
 Telephone: (951) 509-1355
 Facsimile: (951) 509-1356
 dsmith@smitlaw.com
 dferris@smitlaw.com

Attorney for Defendants
 OFFICER CHRISTOPHER ALLEN-YOUNG (erroneously sued
 herein as Torrance Police Department Officer Young), and
 OFFICER JOSHUA SATTERFIELD (erroneously sued
 herein as Torrance Police Department Officer Satterfield)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DIRUL ROBINSON, an individual,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF TORRANCE; TORRANCE
 POLICE DEPARTMENT; TORRANCE
 POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICER
 SATTERFIELD; TORRANCE POLICE
 DEPARTMENT OFFICER YOUNG;
 TORRANCE POLICE DEPARTMENT
 OFFICER WALLACE; TORRANCE
 POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICER
 TOMSIC; DOE POLICE OFFICERS 1-
 20, inclusive; and DOE
 CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS 1-20,
 inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No.: 2:22-cv-05173-RGK(Ex)

)

) **DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO**
) **PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION**
) **TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION**
) **IN LIMINE NO. 5 TO**

) **PRECLUDE ANY**
) **REFERENCE TO THE POST**
) **INCIDENT EMPLOYMENT**
) **STATUS OF THE**
) **DEFENDANTS**

)

) Trial: June 13, 2023

) Time: 9:00 a.m.

) Courtroom: 850

)

) *Complaint filed 7/26/22*

) *First Amended Complaint filed*

) *9/8/22*

1 Defendant County of Riverside (“County”) submits the following Reply to
2 Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Motion in Limine No. 5 To Preclude Any
3 Reference To The Post Incident Employment Status Of The Defendants.

4 **I.**

5 **ARGUMENT**

6 **A. The Defendants Subsequent Employment Status is Irrelevant to The**
7 **Alleged Conduct During This Incident.**

8 Plaintiff has no foundation on which to base his assertion that Defendants’
9 were terminated relating to the alleged text messages, which are not relevant to this
10 case. There is no evidence that Defendants change in employment status is related to
11 their alleged conduct with Plaintiff. Plaintiff’s opposition wishes to confound the issue
12 of the relevance of text messages and their employment status as officers. There is
13 nothing relevant between the two.

14 Medina is analogous to the instant case. Like the officer in Medina, the change
15 in these Defendants’ employment status is completely unrelated to Plaintiff’s claims.
16 In this case, six years have passed since the subject incident. Evidence of these
17 Defendants’ employment status is irrelevant and thus barred under Federal Rule of
18 Evidence, Rule 402. Beckway v. Deshong, 2012 U.S. Dist. Lexis 3972, at *10 (N.D.
19 CA 2012) (Court granting motion in limine excluding any evidence of discipline as it
20 is barred under Fed. R. Evid. 404 and lacked clear relevance); Wilson v. Jara, 2011
21 U.S. Dist. Lexis. 147752, at * 20-21 (D.N. NM Nov. 1, 2011).

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

II.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, Defendants respectfully request the Court enter an Order granting Motion in Limine No. 5 To preclude any reference to the Defendants' employment status after the subject incident.

DATED: June 2, 2023

SMITH LAW OFFICES, LLP

Daniel Ferris

By:

Douglas C. Smith
Daniel W. Ferris
Attorney for Defendants
OFFICER CHRISTOPHER ALLEN-
YOUNG (erroneously sued herein as
Torrance Police Department Officer Young),
and OFFICER JOSHUA SATTERFIELD
(erroneously sued herein as Torrance Police
Department Officer Satterfield)